Application No.: 10/788,801

Reply to Office Action dated: May 7, 2009

Reply dated: August 5, 2009

Remarks/Arguments

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May

7, 2009 and Advisory Action dated July 14, 2009.

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49 were pending in the Application prior to the

outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-

44, and 46-49. The present Response amends claims 1 and 30, cancels Claims 3, 10, 16-29, 32,

39, and 45-49, and adds new claims 50-52, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration

claims 1, 4-9, 11-15, 30, 33-38, 40-44, and 50-52. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Hassan for the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 6,

2009. During the telephone interview, a proposed amendment on independent claim 1 was

discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview.

B. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44 and 46-49 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being

anticipated by Anuff et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 in view of Hough et al. U.S. Patent

Publication No. 2002/0118226, hereinafter Hough.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature "mapping the request to a control tree

factory to generate a control tree, wherein the control tree factory is independent of the

container and is accessible from other containers, wherein at least one of the other containers is

associated with at least one of a different protocol and a different application framework from

the container."

Anuff discloses a portal server that represents an HTML page that comprises a plurality

of modules formatted in a pre-determined layout (Abstract).

Hough discloses a user interface mechanism to relate information from multiple

heterogeneous data sources (Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that Anuff and other cited prior art do not teach or make

obvious that the control tree factory that generates the control tree is independent of the container

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01382US0

M:\tliu\wp\ORACL\1351-1399\1382US0\oracl 1382us0 RCE Reply 071409 AA.doc

Application No.: 10/788,801

Reply to Office Action dated: May 7, 2009

Reply dated: August 5, 2009

and is accessible from multiple containers that are associated with different protocols and

application frameworks.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended,

is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof

is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 30

Claims 16 and 30, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to

Claim 1, are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof

is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-9, 11-15, 33-38, and 40-44

Claims 4-9, 11-15, 33-38, and 40-44 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully

submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim,

and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them

patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations

should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 50-52

Newly added Claims 50-52 depend on Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 50-52 includes new

features that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Anuff and other cited prior art.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50-52, are

neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is

respectfully requested.

C. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the

subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in

expediting issuance of a patent.

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01382US0

Application No.: 10/788,801

Reply to Office Action dated: May 7, 2009

Reply dated: August 5, 2009

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 5, 2009 By: Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu Reg. No. 60,039

Cutomer No.: 80548 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14th Floor San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: (415) 362-3800